

Remarks

This communication is considered fully responsive to the Office Action. Claims 2-50 were examined. Claims 2-50 stand rejected. Claims 2, 17, 18, 31, 35, 48, and 49 are amended. Claims 1 and 51 were previously canceled. Claims 13, 14, 16, 30, 46, and 47 are currently canceled. No new claims have been added. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

The Office Action rejected claims 2, 18, and 35 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0094216 to Wu ("Wu"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 2 is amended to recite "a transparent liquid crystal panel interposed between the touchscreen and the substantially transparent window, the transparent liquid crystal panel providing user feedback about the selected area to scan by switching at least one liquid crystal element in the liquid crystal panel from a transparent state to a light-blocking state in response to at least one touch of the touchscreen to outline a darkened perimeter of the area to scan." Support for this amendment is found in the specification as originally filed. See, e.g., the claims and para. [0037] of the specification.

Wu discloses a grid pattern 46 on the back transparent platen 34 to facilitate alignment of the original document. However, there is no disclosure of any sort of visual feedback outlining a darkened perimeter of the area to scan.

Applicant acknowledges that the Office Action relied on the combined teachings of Wu and U.S. Patent No. 7,292,378 to Chiba, et al. ("Chiba") to reject similar recitations in original claims 13, 14, and 16. Chiba discloses a touch screen adhered to an LCD which is utilized to input commands. However, this arrangement is entirely different than using an LCD to provide visual feedback outlining a darkened perimeter of the area to scan.

That is, the user in Chiba cannot see the area behind the LCD. Instead, the user sees a menu displayed on the LCD. Specifically, Chiba discloses that a menu is displayed on the LCD, and a user performs various operation by touching corresponding portions of the touch screen. With this configuration, a user can select a required operation while visually checking the menu for selection of operations on the LCD, so that probability of erroneous input is reduced as compared to that in a case where various operations are performed by operating the operation switches.

Therefore, combining the teachings of Chiba with the teachings of Wu would put an LCD displaying a menu for a user (as taught by Chiba) behind a sensitive screen (as taught by Wu). This still would not function to provide any sort of visual feedback outlining a darkened perimeter of the area to scan.

Furthermore, Wu specifically teaches against positioning the LCD of Chiba behind the transparent window, because the user would no longer be able to see the scan area as desired by Wu.

For at least the foregoing reasons claim 2 is believed to be allowable over the cited references. Applicant cordially invites the Examiner to telephone the below-listed

attorney if further amendment is believed necessary in order to clarify this distinction in the claims. Otherwise, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 2.

Claim 18 is amended to recite “a liquid crystal panel interposed between the touchscreen and the substantially transparent window, and wherein the liquid crystal panel is used to provide feedback to a user of the system about the area to scan.” Applicant notes that at least these recitations are not taught by the cited references as discussed above in more detail for claim 1. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 18.

Claim 35 is amended to recite “providing feedback about the selected area to scan using a liquid crystal panel interposed between the touchscreen and the substantially transparent window” and “wherein providing feedback about the selected area to scan further comprises switching at least one element of the liquid crystal panel to a light-blocking state.” Applicant notes that at least these recitations are not taught by the cited references as discussed above in more detail for claim 1. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 18.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

The Office Action rejected claims 3-9, 19-26, and 36-41 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claims 3-9 depend from claim 1, claim 19-26 depend from claim 18, and claims 36-41 depend from claim 35. Claims 1, 18, and 35 are believed to be allowable for at

least the reasons discussed above. Therefore, claims 3-9, 19-26, and 36-41 are also believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as the respective independent claims. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 3-9, 19-26, and 36-41 is respectfully requested.

Furthermore, claims 5-7, 24-26, and 37-38 include additional recitations which are not taught or suggested by Wu. Claim 5 recites “only touches occurring during a predetermined interval are considered in the selection of the area to scan.” The Office Action states that it would have been obvious because it depends on when the user wants to input the area to scan. However, this function instead serves to reduce or prevent accidental touching of the touchscreen from being read as input by the user because the user is making the selection with a finger or pointing device and therefore such accidental touching of the screen is possible. Wu specifically discloses other mechanisms for selecting the scan area (e.g., slidebars and a mechanical mouse), and therefore there is no need to reduce or prevent accidental touching of the touchscreen by the user. Claims 6 and 7 include further recitations directed to the predetermined interval. Claims 24-26 and 37-38 include similar recitations to claims 5-7.

The Office Action rejected claims 10-12, 27-29, and 42-45 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu in view of the admitted prior art. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claims 10-12 depend from claim 1, claim 27-29 depend from claim 18, and claims 42-45 depend from claim 35. Claims 1, 18, and 35 are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons discussed above. Therefore, claims 10-12, 27-29, and 42-45 are also

believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as the respective independent claims. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 10-12, 27-29, and 42-45 is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejected claims 13-17, 30-34, and 46-50 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu in view of Chiba. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claims 13-14, 16, 30, and 46-47 are canceled and therefore the rejection of these claims is moot.

Claims 15 and 17 depend from claim 1, claim 31-34 depend from claim 18, and claims 48-50 depend from claim 35. Claims 1, 18, and 35 are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons discussed above. Therefore, claims 15 and 17, 31-34, and 48-50 are also believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as the respective independent claims. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 15 and 17, 31-34, and 48-50 is respectfully requested.

Furthermore, claims 15, 17, 32, 34, 48, and 50 include additional recitations directed to the liquid crystal elements. Because the liquid crystal elements are not properly taught or suggested by Wu in view of Chiba, as discussed above, then it follows that the additional recitations for the liquid crystal elements also are not properly taught or suggested by these references.

Conclusion

The Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this matter.

Respectfully Submitted,

/Mark D. Trenner/

Dated: November 2, 2008

By: _____

Mark D. Trenner
Reg. No. 43,961
(720) 221-3708